

REMARKS

The Office Action requires election of an invention from the following: Group I, directed to battery packs, including claims 1-4; and Group II, directed to methods for manufacturing a battery pack, including claims 5-15.

Additionally, the Office Action requires election of a species from the following: Species Ia, directed to a battery pack comprising a molded resin for uniting an external terminal only; Species Ib, directed to the battery pack comprising multiple resin features such as upper resin mold, lower resin mold for connecting the battery features; Species IIa, drawn to the first manufacturing method (Figure 9A and page 30); Species IIb, drawn to the second manufacturing method (Figure 16A and page 36); Species IIc, drawn to the third manufacturing method (Figure 17 and page 39); and Species IId, drawn to the fourth manufacturing method (Figure 19A and page 41).

The Office Action indicates that no claim is generic and that species Ia corresponds to claim 1 and that species Ib corresponds to claims 2-4.

Applicants elect Group I and Species Ib directed to claims 2-4. Claims 2-4 include the same elements as claim 1 and therefore claim 1 is generic. Accordingly, claims 1-4 read on the elected species.

The Office Action states that there is no unity of invention between Groups I and II because the molded resin for connecting a battery and a substrate is known in the art as evidenced by WO2004/103282, WO2004/100873, and

WO2006/002236. Also, the Office Action states that method claims 5-15 recite or imply structurally connecting steps not encompassed in the structural features of claims 1-4. Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement between Groups I and II since the Office Action has not demonstrated how the WO publications mentioned in the Office Action are directed to batteries. Moreover, the Office Action has not delineated which structurally connecting steps are not encompassed in the form of structural features of the product embodiments of claims 1-4.

The Office Action justifies the restriction based on election of species on the arguments regarding the WO publications mentioned above. Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction based on species since the Office Action has not demonstrated how the WO publications mentioned in the Office Action are directed to batteries.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Jordan and Hamburg LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg.No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

B and,

By Ricardo Unikel
Ricardo Unikel
Reg. No. 52,309
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340